Application No. 09/671,555   Atty. Docket No. 042390. P4525D
Amendment dated October 19, 2005   Examiner Rachna Singh
Response to Office Action of July 19, 2005   TC/A.U. 2176

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 28-29, 32, 36, 38, 43-45, 48-54 have been amended. Claims 28-56 remain pending.

CONFERENCE REQUEST

IF THE FOREGOING IS NOT DEEMED TO PLACE THE CLAIMS IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE, THE EXAMINER IS REQUESTED TO CONTACT THE UNDERSIGNED AND PERFORM A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW.

Response To Advisory Action

In reviewing the Advisory Action dated October 3, 2005, it is appears the Office does not quite grasp the intended use of the term persistence in the claims and its effect on retaining display of first data in the information browser while allowing second data to be selectively, e.g., if desired, replaced with new data incident to a navigation event.

The general idea here is that a conventional information browser such as a web browser can be directed to load data, such as a web page, irrespective of what is currently being displayed by the information browser. There are many ways to direct this loading, including defining a web page (which may be a frames based page) that directs the information browser to load new data, e.g. a new web page, or by way of activating navigation controls of a user interface to the information browser, e.g., by entering an address into an address bar, pressing a Forward, Back, or Home button, etc. Any of these ways may be performed to direct the information browser to load data.

-10-

While the Examiner is right that frames may be used to define different portions

of an information browser that may be updated independently of each other (each frame

is logically it's own web page instance), there is <u>nothing</u> about frames that <u>actively</u>

<u>prevents</u> the information browser from being directed to load new data, such as a new

web page unrelated to a currently displayed web page with frames. That is, frames <u>only</u>

work as suggested by the Office if and when the code in the frames is <u>aware</u> of the

frames and uses specifically structured HTML commands to direct replacement of data

in a particular frame. If code is loaded in a frame that generally directs the information

browser to navigate to a new web page, e.g., it is not written to support the frames, then

that navigation will occur generally, <u>causing the frames based page to be behind</u>. There

is nothing in the W3C or La Strange documents to prevent this. Again, unless the code

in the frames is specially written to support the frames, a conventional information

browser will navigate to a new web page, leaving the frames based page behind.

This is **not** what is claimed.

Recited embodiments concern modifying a conventional information browser so

that it is configured to recognize and provide an <u>unconventional</u> response to a request

to navigate the information browser to display new data, e.g., to navigate away from

displaying first and second data and to instead display the new data. As discussed

above, a conventional browser would do so. But this is **not** what is claimed. Instead,

claim 1 (which has been amended in an effort to clarify inventive intent in response to

the apparent confusion over inventive intent indicated in the Office Action and Advisory

Action) has been amended to recite:

-11-

Application No. 09/671,555   Atty. Docket No. 042390. P4525D
Amendment dated October 19, 2005   Examiner Rachna Singh
Response to Office Action of July 19, 2005   TC/A.U. 2176

      28.   A method for persistently displaying data in an information browser navigatable based at least in part on a request associated with a navigation operation definable in data loadable in the information browser or a navigation user-interface operable independent of the navigation operation, comprising:

      displaying first and second data in at least one display region of the information browser;

      configuring the information browser to selectively update the display region responsive to requests to navigate the information browser away from displaying the first and second data;

      receiving the request to navigate the browser away from displaying the first and second data and display new data in the display region; and

      responsive to the request, persistently displaying the first data and replacing displaying the second data with displaying the new data.

The interaction among the claim elements should now be more clear, as should the intent that recited embodiment include catching any navigation requests arising from use of a user-interface of the information browser as well as from navigation requests defined by data loaded into the information browser. The recited " persistently displaying the first data and allowing the new data to replace the second data in the display region" simply is not possible with the W3C/La Strange documents relied on by the Office.

The frames teachings relied on by the Office has no frame option or frame command to prevent the information browser from responding to the recited received request and hence losing the first data as it responds to the request. It is respectfully submitted that the recited persistence of the first data is is not possible with the documents relied on by the Office. (For clarity, and brevity, Applicant's previous arguments regarding these documents are incorporated herein by reference.)

Related amendments have been made to claim 43 and this claim should be allowable for corresponding reasons as discussed above.

Application No. 09/671,555   Atty. Docket No. 042390. P4525D
Amendment dated October 19, 2005   Examiner Rachna Singh
Response to Office Action of July 19, 2005   TC/A.U. 2176

35 USC §112

Claims 28-42 remain rejected under 35 USC §112 ¶2 as being indefinite. While

Applicant previously traversed these rejections, it is believed these rejections are now

moot in light of the amendments to the recited.

35 USC §103(a)

Claims 28-54 remain rejected as being obvious over W3C "Implementing HTML

Frames" in view of LaStrange (US Patent No. 5,784,058). While Applicant previously

traversed these rejections, it is believed these rejections are now moot in light of the

amendments to the recited.

As discussed previously, one fundamental problem with LaStrange is that it

resolves its "persistence" by opening a NEW web page window (col. 1 lines 51-52). As

should be apparent in the amended embodiments, this is not what is claimed. Recited

embodiments do not open new windows to display new information and such an action

is fundamentally different from combining information into the display region as recited.

Also, as discussed above regarding the Advisory Action, frames based web pages can

not prevent information browser navigation.

Thus, based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither the W3C

document, nor the La Strange document, whether considered individually or one in

combination with the other, can render the recited embodiments obvious.

-13-

Application No. 09/671,555   Atty. Docket No. 042390. P4525D
Amendment dated October 19, 2005   Examiner Rachna Singh
Response to Office Action of July 19, 2005   TC/A.U. 2176

Amendments to Claims 44, 45, 48-54

These claims have been amended to make their claim preambles consistent to

changes made to independent claim 43.

Conclusion

It is believed all past rejections have been addressed through the amendments

above. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons and reasons discussed in past

responses, claims 28-56 are deemed in condition for allowance and such action is

earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account

number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2005

/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /
Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

-14-